

### ***REMARKS***

In the January 11, 2008 Office Action, claims 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-23, 26, and 28-30 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claims 28-30 were objected to for containing informalities. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the January 11, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 28-30, as indicated above. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

### ***Claim Objections***

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 28-30 were objected to because claims 28-30 contained improper languages. In response, Applicants have amended claims 28-30 to recite time signals. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 28-30 are now correct. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 10, 12-14, 18-23, and 28-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,365,139 (Kasuga et al.). In item 5 of the Office Action, claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasuga in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,236 (Nagasaka). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

More specifically, with regards to claim 10, Applicants respectfully assert that Kasuga is different. It is clearly stated in Response to Arguments in the Office Action that Kasuga disclosed updating time as illustrated in Fig. 32. Applicants respectfully disagree. Kasuga discloses in column 6, lines 39-40 that Fig. 32 is a block diagram of the embodiment of the novel pocket bell, pager, mobile telephone, and alarm. Applicants respectfully believe that rejections based on the assumption that Kasuga discloses a radio controlled timepiece in Fig.

32 are not proper. Applicants respectfully assert that Kasuga discloses the received signals amplified by a receiver circuit and converted into other forms, but these other forms are not necessarily updated time information.

Nagasaka was cited in the Office Action to only show a timepiece where electric energy necessary to drive the wrist watch is generated by the movement and accumulated in a capacitor, and that an electronic circuit is driven by the electric energy.

Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Kasuga, Nagasaka, or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art *suggests* the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the radio controlled timepiece.

Further, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references realized problems that Applicants try to solve and benefits of employing the configurations with a piezoelectric actuator for a radio controlled timepiece. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references nor any combination thereof makes the present invention obvious.

Since claims 18, 19, 21, and 26 similarly recite, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 18, 19, 21, and 26 are allowable for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 12-15, 22 and 23 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 18, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 12-15, 22, 23, and 28-30 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention

Appl. No. 10/780,903  
Amendment dated April 10, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2008

as set forth in independent claims 1 and 18, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

\* \* \*

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10, 12-15, 18, 19, 21-23 and 26 are now in condition for allowance.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Akiyoshi Onda/  
Akiyoshi Onda  
Limited Recognition No. L0336

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: April 10, 2008  
S:\01-JAN08-AOSE-US045035 Amendment.doc